	Case 1:20-cv-00476-JLT-GSA Documer	nt 41 Filed 12/28/22 Page 1 of 2	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	LAMAR BROOKS,	Case No. 1:20-cv-0476 JLT GSA (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING THE ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE, AND DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE THIS CASE	
13	v.		
14	ARRIZOLA, et al.,		
15	Defendants.	(Doc. 9)	
16		I	
17	Lamar Brooks initiated this action as a state prisoner proceeding pro se by filing a civil		
18	rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. §1983. (Doc. 1.) Defendant Arrizola filed a motion for		
19	summary judgment, after which the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an opposition or statement of		
20	non-opposition within 30 days. (Doc. 37.) However, the Court's mail was returned as		
21	undeliverable.		
22	The magistrate judge determined Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court's order dated		
23	September 16, 2022. (Doc. 40.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the action be		
24	dismissed without prejudice. (<i>Id.</i> at 2-3.) The Findings and Recommendations were served on all		
25	parties, including Plaintiff at his only address known to the Court, on October 27, 2022. The		
26	Findings and Recommendations also contained a notice that any objections were to be filed		
27	within 14 days of the date of service. (Id. at 3.) To date, no objections have been filed and the		
28	time to do so has expired.		

Case 1:20-cv-00476-JLT-GSA Document 41 Filed 12/28/22 Page 2 of 2

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § $636(b)(1)(C)$, the Court conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this
case. Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, the Court concludes the Findings and
Recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Moreover, Plaintiff failed
to comply with this Court's Local Rules, which require him to keep the Court apprised of a current
mailing address, as it has been more than 63 days since the Court's mail was first returned on
October 24, 2022. See Local Rule 183(b). Because no change of address has been provided,
dismissal is also appropriate due to Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the
Local Rules. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure
to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on October 27, 2022 (Doc. 40) are adopted in full.
- 2. The action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.
- 3. Defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 36) is terminated as **MOOT**.
- 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **December 27, 2022**